



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. III

NEW YORK, MARCH 12, 1910

No. 19

At the last meeting of the American Philological Association, held in Baltimore, in December last, Professor Hale, of Chicago, read a paper on the possibility of a uniform system of terminology for all languages studied, ancient and modern. The occasion for the paper was his observation that in the High Schools pupils studying several languages have to learn different terms for identical things and the technical language of one class-room is entirely different from that of the adjoining one.

A movement for uniformity in grammatical terminology was started at the meeting of the English Classical Association, on October 10, 1908, and various scientific bodies in England and in this country have signified their approval of the project. In England it has gone so far that a joint committee representing eight associations of teachers of ancient and modern languages has been formed, consisting of the following members: Professor E. A. Sonnenschein, of Birmingham (Chairman); Dr. Henry Bradley, of Oxford; Mr. Cloudesley Brereton, of London; Miss Haig Brown, of Oxford; Mr. G. H. Clarke, of Acton; Rev. W. C. Compton, of Dover; Miss J. Dingwall, of Clapham; Professor H. G. Fiedler, of Oxford; Rev. Dr. J. W. Gow, of Westminster; Miss E. M. Hastings, of London; Mr. P. Shaw Jeffrey, of Colchester; Mr. E. L. Milner-Barry, of Berkhamsted; Mr. W. E. P. Pantin, of St. Paul's School; Miss A. S. Paul, of Clapham; Dr. Eleanor Purdie, of Cheltenham; Professor Rippmann, of London; Dr. Rouse, of Cambridge; Dr. W. G. Rushbrooke, of St. Olave's; Dr. F. Spencer, of London; Mr. F. E. Thompson, of London, and Professor R. S. Conway, of Manchester (Secretary).

This committee recently presented an Interim Report, which is printed in the December number of *Modern Language Teaching*. This report presents twenty-five recommendations. The substance of them is as follows: Teachers of the different languages shall agree to use the following terms for identical phenomena: *Subject*, *Predicate*, *Predicative*, as applied to the adjective, noun, or pronoun, whether they are in combination with the verb, or with the subject, or any other part of the sentence; *Attributive*, adjective or noun; *Object*; *Adverbial Qualification*, to denote the adverbial part of the predicate, including indirect object, which is to be abolished. Sentences are to be divided into Simple

and Complex. The Complex may be either Double, Treble, or Multiple. In this way the Compound Sentence is avoided. The part of the sentence equivalent to noun, adjective or adverb is to be called *Noun*, *Adjective*, or *Adverb Clause*. The independent part of a Complex Sentence is to be called the *Main Clause*. If the part of the sentence equivalent to a noun, adjective, or adverb has no subject or predicate of its own, it is called a *Noun*, *Adjective*, or *Adverb Phrase*. *Noun* and not 'Substantive' is the part of speech. The parts of speech are *Noun*, *Pronoun*, *Adjective*, *Verb*, *Adverb*, *Conjunction*, *Preposition*; thus *Article* and *Numeral* are not parts of speech, but the terms may be used. *Possessive Adjectives* designate all words like 'my', 'thy', etc., but 'mine', 'thine', etc., are *Possessive Pronouns*. 'This' and 'that' are *Demonstrative Adjectives* or *Pronouns*. *Ipse*, *selbst*, *même*, *self*, are *Emphasizing Adjectives* or *Pronouns*. English names of cases are discarded, the case-names being in all languages in this order; *Nominative*, *Vocative*, *Accusative*, *Genitive*, *Dative*, with the addition for Latin of the *Ablative* and the *Locative*. In French and English the case used after prepositions is to be called the Accusative. In French the terms *Heavy* and *Light* Pronouns are preferable to 'Disjunctive' and 'Emphatic', or 'Conjunctive' and 'Unemphatic'. In English there is no gender recognized except in pronouns of the third person. The names for the tenses vary slightly in the different languages. The scheme for the Indicative follows:

In English we have Present, Future, Past, Future in the past (*would write*), Present Perfect, Future Perfect, Past Perfect, Future Perfect in the past (*would have written*), with special Continuous Forms of each (*is writing*, etc). German has only Present, Future, Past, Perfect, Future Perfect, Past Perfect. In French we have also Past Continuous or Imperfect, Past Historic and second Past Perfect. In Latin and Greek Past Continuous is a variant for Imperfect and in Greek the Aorist is added. In German Preterite Perfect or Plusquamperfekt may be used for Past Perfect and Futurum Exatum for Future Perfect.

It is to be observed that the report touches only the fundamentals of objective nomenclature and very little real interference with time-honored terms is indicated thus far. The real trouble is going to come in the discussion of syntactical phe-

nomena; here the analysis is in many cases subjective, and the name of the term is apt to be much more important in the eyes of its sponsor than any consideration of teaching or learning. Who shall decide whether the Future is to be More Vivid or Less Vivid? Who shall distinguish between Anticipatory and Prospective? Who shall settle the question as to Historical or Temporal Cum? Who shall tell us what 'contingency' means in Syntax? As was remarked at the meeting of the Philological Association, the proposition is probably doomed to failure as soon as it gets past the initial steps indicated in this report, for, however much we desiderate uniformity in terminology, with all due respect to the honorable committee, it has barely begun its labors.

G. L.

## LATIN IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

### II

In my first article (pages 140-142) I tried to show what we actually accomplish, and what I believe we should accomplish, and in what manner.

When our boys reach Caesar, we are no longer as free as we were in the work of the first year. For we are confronted by the definite task of reading the first four books of *The Gallic War*, and of giving 20 per cent of the time of the year—the equivalent of one period per week—to the translation of fairly simple English sentences, based on the text read, into Latin. To quote Cicero, I shall take up this subject "in Homer's manner, the latter topic first".

As a matter of fact, we depart somewhat radically from the requirements as laid down in the Syllabus for High Schools; we devote considerably more time to the prose work than is prescribed. Of a period of 42 minutes, I personally devote ten every day to it, and my colleagues do no less, some even more. We defend this on the score that our prose work includes the grammatical instruction needed during the year. In the second place, we differ, I think, from most schools in that our translation work during this year is largely oral. The book which we use contains twenty sentences in each exercise. After the rules of grammar, which head each lesson, have been gone over, and learned—stress is laid in this on the memorizing of an example for each rule—four to five sentences are assigned for each day. These may or may not be gone over in class; that depends largely on the time at the teacher's disposal. On the next day, the teacher reads out a sentence, while the students keep their books closed, and then he calls on a boy to translate. The boy is allowed to finish his work as well as he can, and only then the necessary corrections are made by teacher and class in common. After the task is finished, another group of sen-

tences is assigned and the next day both these and the old sentences—these latter often slightly varied—are called for, and so forth. While it seems to demand a great amount of time, this method works very well in practice, and after a while it is possible to go over twelve to eighteen sentences in no more than fifteen minutes. When all the sentences of a lesson have been done, a review is set for the next day, and this is carried on in writing, the teacher giving from three to five sentences. These are new in so far as they do not occur in the lesson, but are strictly limited in vocabulary and rules to the exercise to be reviewed. In this practice the guiding principle, to quote one of my colleagues, is that one sentence reviewed three times is worth five done but once. The monotony of this exercise is often varied by having the sentences done at the blackboard, with the corrections done as in oral work. The latter method has the advantage that it saves time, because it is possible to do the review translation of the text while boys are working at the board. Its disadvantage lies in the divided attention.

While the prose work, as thus carried on, is fairly satisfactory to ourselves, and works well also in regard to the State Examinations, which our boys on the whole pass very satisfactorily, it has the grave objection that it consumes an inordinate amount of time. It also lays us open to the charge of violating the principle that the work in prose should be based on portions of the text recently read. In this connection, I beg to say, though, that I do not believe in this principle. It is true that the work in prose should be based on the text, but it seems to me sufficient to employ the vocabulary, and occasionally the so-called idioms. To base the exercises in content on the text recently read leads in many instances—and text books—to a form of exercise which comes near to the 'trot', and I know from experience that a bright boy actually does use his prose book in this manner. I do not mean to disparage the value of what the Germans call 'retroversion', but I believe that this method should be used as it is in Germany, very sparingly, and largely as sight work. That our method of working does decidedly not prepare for the Elementary Composition of the College Entrance Examinations is a minor consideration, because I believe that this task should not be attempted by the student before the end of the third year. On the whole we discourage our students even from taking the Caesar examination at the end of the second year, in the conviction that a boy who has done his duty has attained so much more maturity at the end of the third year that this more than outweighs the loss of memory for the prepared text of Caesar.

The task of reading the required text is much less satisfactory. In the first place, the teachers of the third term complain, as I have stated in my first ar-